

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vinginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	PIDOTALANDO DA PIO		
	THE SAIL	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/507,428	02/19/2000	Todd M. Spencer	10991108-1	1394
	590 08/07/2003			
P O BOX 2724	ACKARD COMPAN 00, 3404 E. HARMON	YROAD	EXAMINER	
INTELLECTU.	UAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION INS, CO 80527-2400		KUPSTAS, TOD A	
	,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	
			DATE MAILED: 08/07/2003	Ķ

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

The MAILING DATE of this communication apperent of the communication apperent of the communication apperent of the communication apperent of the communication. A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply will find the communication of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will and reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing dearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Fee 2a) This action is FINAL.	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(is(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a ause the application to become ABANDONED ate of this communication, even if timely filed, abruary 2003. action is non-final.	S) FROM nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). may reduce any
The MAILING DATE of this communication apper Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply were if NO period for reply sis specified above, the maximum statutory period will. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, or any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing disearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Fee	Examiner Tod Kupstas Pars on the cover sheet with the countries of the countr	Art Unit 2153 Correspondence address S) FROM The providence address S) will be considered timely. The mailing date of this communication. Do (35 U.S.C. § 133). The providence any service any service and service an
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperent of the Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply wif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, concentration and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Fee.	Tod Kupstas Pars on the cover sheet with the country of the cover sheet with the country of the cover sheet with the country of the country of the cover sheet with the country of the co	2153 S) FROM nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). may reduce any
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply wif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, concentration after the mailing diseasement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Feb.	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH((ia). In no event, however, may a reply be time (ib) within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days (ia) apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (ia) ause the application to become ABANDONED (ia) attention of thirty (30) days (ib) apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (iii) apply and will expire SIX (6) months from (iii) apply and will	S) FROM nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). may reduce any
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply wif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, c: - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing die earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Fee.	IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(is(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a ause the application to become ABANDONED ate of this communication, even if timely filed, abruary 2003. action is non-final.	S) FROM nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). may reduce any
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply will. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, or any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing diearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Fee.	ida). In no event, however, may a reply be time vithin the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days a paply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONED ate of this communication, even if timely filed, about 2003.	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). . may reduce any
201 This action is surrounded to 11/10/19	action is non-final.	osecution as to the merits is
20\M This	action is non-final.	osecution as to the merits is
	OO OVOOR For Form 1	osecution as to the merits is
	ce except for formal matters, pro x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 48	osecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex		03 O.G. 213.
4) \boxtimes Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn	from consideration	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or el	lection requirement.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted	dorb) abjected to be the F	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the dr	awing(s) he held in all and	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is:	: a) approved b) disconnection	937 CFR 1.85(a).
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to	to this Office action	ed by the Examiner.
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	iner	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign pri	iority under 25 LLC O S 4400 V	(D
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	only under 35 0.5.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	we have received	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ave been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority of	de sum and a language of the sum	No
Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the second seco	Te certified conies not received	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic pri	ority under 35 U.S.C. 8 119(a) (to a provisional applications
a) The translation of the foreign language provision 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic pri	anal andingstone	
	2 120 an	iu/UI 127.
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	4) Interview Summary (PT 5) Notice of Informal Pater 6) Other:	FO-413) Paper No(s) nt Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Varma (US 6,336,134).

As set forth in claim 1, Varma discloses a system (fig. 2 (shows a computer system)) for providing synchronization verification of multiple applications across remote systems; see col. 7, lines 15-18 (these lines disclose the synchronization of the programs), the synchronization verification system comprising: local application sharing logic configured to receive events to be

Page 3

Art Unit: 2153

shared from a local application comprising at least one local application window, and transmit said events to be shared; see col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 7, lines 1-21 (the synchronization information is utilized to maintain the uniformity of the system and work spaces used); remote application sharing logic configured to receive events to be shared from said local application sharing logic (the synchronization), and transmit said events to at least one corresponding remote application comprising at least one remote application window, for processing (part of the synchronization involves communication with the other client); and window synchronization verification logic configured to correlate said sat least one local application window with said at least one remote application window (the synchronization of the system performs this correlation; see generally col. 5-col. 13, for the disclosure related to the synchronization of the system. The system generally involves the collaboration of clients in a work space. This collaboration requires the synchronization of information in order to perform the workgroup functions over a network. The system additionally delineates between both static and dynamic areas for determining the relevant synchronization system).

As set forth in claim 2, Varma discloses a system wherein said window synchronization verification logic further comprises: static synchronization verification logic configured to verify synchronization of said at least one local application window with said at least one remote application window at system startup; see col. 6, lines 55-60 (here it states that the system determines which partitions can remain unchanged in contrast to the dynamically changed elements, this is the static synchronization).

Art Unit: 2153

Page 4

As set forth in claim 3, Varma discloses a system wherein said static synchronization verification logic further comprises: local static synchronization verification logic configured to select said first local application window and direct said at least one corresponding remote application to locate a first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window; and remote static synchronization verification logic configured to find said first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window in said at least one corresponding remote application; see col. 6, line 53-col. 7, line 21 (part of the synchronization involves correlating the programs to be synchronized with each other).

As set forth in claim 4, Varma discloses a system wherein remote static synchronization verification logic further comprises: remote static synchronization reply logic configured to notify said local static synchronization verification logic if said first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window is found in said at least one corresponding remote application; and wherein said local static synchronization verification logic further comprises: local message generation logic configured to generate a message for display to said local application if said first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window is not found; see col. 17, line 62-col. 18, line 14 (indication that the specified program is not existent, upon attempting to perform a modification notification is sent as to whether that modification is permitted by the client).

As set forth in claim 5, Varma discloses a system wherein said window synchronization verification logic further comprises: dynamic synchronization verification logic configured to

Art Unit: 2153

Page 5

verify synchronization of said at least one local application verification logic configured to verify synchronization of said at least one local application window with said at least one remote application window when said events to be shared are received by said remote application sharing logic; see col. 13, line 60-col. 14, line 59, and col. 5, lines 47-59 (the dynamic process and the work spaces are synchronized to each other so that the dynamically altered areas are synchronized).

As set forth in claim 7, Varma discloses a method for providing synchronization verification of multiple applications across remote systems (fig. 2 (shows a computer system)) also see col. 7, lines 15-18 (these lines disclose the synchronization of the programs), comprising the steps of: selecting a local application, said local application at least one local application window, to share events with at least one corresponding remote application; see col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 7, lines 1-21 (the synchronization information is utilized to maintain the uniformity of the system and work spaces used), said at least one corresponding remote application including at least one remote application window (the synchronization requires communication with another client); transmitting said shared events from said at least one local application window to said at least one remote application window for processing (part of the synchronization process); and verifying synchronization of said at least one local application window with said at least one remote application window; see generally col. 5-col. 13, for the disclosure related to the synchronization of the system. The system generally involves the collaboration of clients in a work space. This collaboration requires the synchronization of information in order to perform the

Page 6

Art Unit: 2153

workgroup functions over a network. The system additionally delineates between both static and dynamic areas for determining the relevant synchronization system).

As set forth in claim 8, Varma discloses a method further comprising the step of: providing static synchronization of said at least one local application window with said at least one remote application window prior to transmitting said shared events; see col. 6, lines 55-60 (here it states that the system determines which partitions can remain unchanged in contrast to the dynamically changed elements, this is the static synchronization).

As set forth in claim 9, Varma discloses a method further comprising the steps of: selecting a first local application window; directing said at least one corresponding remote application to locate a first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window; and finding said first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window in said at least one corresponding remote application; see col. 6, line 53-col. 7, line 21 (part of the synchronization involves correlating the programs to be synchronized with each other).

As set forth in claim 10, Varma discloses a method further comprising the steps of: notifying said local application if said first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window is found in said at least one corresponding remote application; and generating a message for display by said local application if said first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window is not found; see col. 17, line 62-col. 18, line

Art Unit: 2153

14 (indication that the specified program is not existent, upon attempting to perform a modification notification is sent as to whether that modification is permitted by the client).

As set forth in claim 11, Varma discloses a method further comprising the step: verifying synchronization of said at least one local application window with said at least one remote application window when said events to be shared are received by said at least one remote application window; see col. 13, line 60-col. 14, line 59, and col. 5, lines 47-59 (the dynamic process and the work spaces are synchronized to each other so that the dynamically altered areas are synchronized).

As set forth in claim 13, Varma discloses a system for providing synchronization verification of multiple applications across remote systems (fig. 2 (shows a computer system)) also see col. 7, lines 15-18 (these lines disclose the synchronization of the programs), the synchronization verification system comprising: means for selecting a local application, said local application including at least one local application window to share events with at least one corresponding remote application; see col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 7, lines 1-21 (the synchronization information is utilized to maintain the uniformity of the system and work spaces used), said at least one corresponding remote application including at least one remote application window; means for transmitting said shared events from said at least one local application window to said at least one remote application window for processing (part of the synchronization process requires communication with another client); and means for verifying synchronization of said at least one local application window with said at least one remote application window; see generally

Art Unit: 2153

col. 5-col. 13, for the disclosure related to the synchronization of the system. The system generally involves the collaboration of clients in a work space. This collaboration requires the synchronization of information in order to perform the workgroup functions over a network. The system additionally delineates between both static and dynamic areas for determining the relevant synchronization system).

Page 8

As set forth in claim 14, Varma discloses a system wherein said verifying synchronization means further comprises: means for providing static synchronization of said at least one local application window with said at least one remote application window prior to transmitting said share events; see col. 6, lines 55-60 (here it states that the system determines which partitions can remain unchanged in contrast to the dynamically changed elements, this is the static synchronization).

As set forth in claim 15, Varma discloses a system wherein said means for providing static synchronization further comprises: means for selecting a first local application window; means for directing said at least one corresponding remote application to locate a first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window; and means for finding said first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window in said at least one corresponding remote application; see col. 6, line 53-col. 7, line 21 (part of the synchronization involves correlating the programs to be synchronized with each other).

As set forth in claim 16, Varma discloses a system wherein said means for providing static synchronization further comprises: means for notifying said local application if said first remote

Art Unit: 2153

Page 9

application window corresponding to said first local application window is found in said at least one corresponding remote application; and means for generating a message for display by said local application if said first remote application window corresponding to said first local application window is not found; see col. 17, line 62-col. 18, line 14 (indication that the specified program is not existent, upon attempting to perform a modification notification is sent as to whether that modification is permitted by the client).

As set forth in claim 17, Varma discloses a system further comprising: means for dynamic synchronization of said at least one local application window with said at least one remote application window when said shared events are received by said at least one remote application window; see col. 13, line 60-col. 14, line 59, and col. 5, lines 47-59 (the dynamic process and the work spaces are synchronized to each other so that the dynamically altered areas are synchronized).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 09/507,428 Page 10

Art Unit: 2153

4. Claims 6, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Varma (US 6,336,134) in view of Katsurabayashi (US 6,308,199).

Varma discloses having the synchronization system, however Varma does not disclose providing for a failed dynamic synchronization message. Katsurabayashi discloses a system for having a shared work space, wherein a check is made as to whether or not synchronization is established. Further processing of information is based on the notification of whether or not the synchronization is established and the systems are notified as to the status of the system; see col. 9, lines 49-63. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time this invention was made to have provided the system of Varma, with failed synchronization notification, as taught by Katsurabayashi. The rationale is as follows: It would have desirable to have provided notice to the system of failed synchronization. As Katsurabayashi teaches the desirability of providing notice of synchronization failure, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated by Katsurabayashi's teaching to have provided the system of Varma with means for notifying a client of dynamic synchronization failure, thereby having provided indication means for informing a client as to the reason for work space failure and means for providing notice for need for reestablishment of synchronization.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's arguments filed 2/10/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2153

Page 11

Applicant argues on page 4 of the response that there are no means within Varma to verify synchronization. The Examiner disagrees noting that Varma is directed to providing collaboration over a network. Part of this collaboration procedure is to ensure that the respective partitions are synchronized. In order to accomplish this the system constantly checks and rechecks various parameters related to history servers; see col. 6, line 53-col. 7, line 21, also see for example, col. 9, line 51-col. 13, line 57, for a discussion on the various ways in which synchronization is achieved in the systems. This rechecking and analysis of the history of events provides verification that the system is synchronized. The systems disclosed in Varma enable the system to constantly be reverifying the existence of synchronization.

On page 4, Applicant further argues that Varma does not share "events" and instead shares "modifications." The Examiner first notes that a modification is an event, and therefore Varma meets the limitations of the claims. The Examiner does not see how the term "events" has been narrowly defined to preclude the inclusion of "modifications" within that term. However, the Examiner also points to col. 11, lines 48-63, wherein those lines set forth the variability of defining what constitutes a modification. The Examiner maintains that Varma teaches this limitation of the claims.

On pages 4-5, Applicant argues that Varma does not disclose the existence of "remote sharing logic." Applicant argues that since Varma discloses that modification requests are transmitted directly to the respective partition server there would be no remote sharing logic. The Examiner disagrees, noting that the term "remote sharing logic," or "corresponding remote

Application/Control Number: 09/507,428 Page 12

Art Unit: 2153

application," merely implies that there is logic on the other systems in the network related to the synchronization of the system. This is at least met by the clients in Varma's system having their respective systems enabled to perform and receive synchronization input. When a client in Varma is participating in a collaborative session with another client, that other client has "remote sharing logic" to enable the collaborative session to operate. The Examiner maintains that the limitations of the claims are met by Varma.

Applicant argues on page 6, that there is "no motivation found in the prior art that would teach one of ordinary skill to combine the references as suggested." Motivation can be found in the teaching Katsurabayashi. Katsurabayashi teaches the desirability of providing notice of synchronization failure, one of ordinary skill would have been motivated by Katsurabayashi's teaching to have provided the system of Varma with means for notifying a client of dynamic synchronization failure, thereby having provided indication means for informing a client as to the reason for work space failure and means for providing notice for need for reestablishment of synchronization. The motivation is therefore found in benefit the usage of such a notification system would provide to one of ordinary skill in the art. The Examiner maintains that the combination is proper.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/507,428 Page 13

Art Unit: 2153

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tod Kupstas whose telephone number is (703) 305-2655.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess, can be reached at (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for this art unit is (703) 308-7201. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the technology center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

August 2003

KRISNA LIM